

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Original Claim 1 is directed to a sensor holder. Claim 1 is amended here to make clear that the sensor is inferentially recited. Further claim amendments address the remaining issues. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

This application's disclosure pertains to a sensor holder for rectangular-shaped sensors 32. A first component 12 clamps the sensors 32 so that they protrude through openings 38 in a second component 14. Each opening 38 has a rectangular-shaped surface which tightly seals with its respective rectangular-shaped sensor 32 when the first and second components are pressed together.

Claim 1 is rejected as being anticipated by Hilgner.

As amended, Claim 1 recites a sensor holder for arranging at least one rectangular-shaped sensor through a wall, the sensor holder including a first component adapted to hold the sensor and a second component having least one throughgoing opening, wherein a rectangular-shaped envelope surface of the throughgoing opening in the second component is adapted to be tightly sealed to the sensor when pressing together the first and second component of the sensor holder.

Hilgner discloses a fixture for mounting a sensor. As discussed in lines 48-50 of column 2 of Hilgner, clamping ring 12 has a cylindrical inner surface. Moreover, the seals 18 are sealing rings, and the setting collar 19 is circular as illustrated in Fig.

2. Accordingly, It is quite clear that probe tube 3 and the openings through which it extends are all cylindrical.

The Official Action interprets the opening in Hilgner's mounting plate 17 as corresponding to an opening in a second component. However, as explained above, this opening's surface is cylindrical, and therefore is not a rectangular-shaped envelope surface as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over Hilger, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 as being anticipated by Hilger is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is also rejected as being anticipated by Tow.

The Official Action interprets inner radial surface 86 of Tow's adapter 70' as corresponding to an opening in a second component. However, in view of this surface being radial, as well as being internally-threaded as discussed in lines 10-11 of column 5 of Tow, surface 86 is clearly cylindrical, and therefore is not a rectangular-shaped envelope surface as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is also allowable over Tow, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 as being anticipated by Tow is respectfully requested.

New Claim 19 recites a sensor and a sensor holder, the sensor holder comprising a first component and a second component, the first component holding the sensor, the second component being provided with a first sealing surface and at least one throughgoing opening, the sensor extending from the first component and through the opening in the second component, and a portion of the throughgoing opening of the second component being frusto conical.

New Claim 19 is allowable over Hilgner. For example, Hilgner's mounting plate 17 does not include a throughgoing opening having a frustoconical portion.

New Claim 19 is also allowable over Tow. For example, Tow's sensor 20 does not extend from the fastening member 80' and through an opening in the adapter 70'.

New Claim 20 recites a polygonal-shaped sensor and a sensor holder, the sensor holder comprising a first component and a second component, the first component holding the polygonal-shaped sensor, the second component being provided with a first sealing surface and at least one throughgoing opening, the polygonal-shaped sensor extending from the first component and through the opening in the second component, a polygonal-shaped envelope surface of the throughgoing opening in the second component being tightly sealed to the polygonal-shaped sensor.

New Claim 20 is allowable over Hilgner. For example, consistent with the above discussion, Hilgner's probe tube 3 and the openings through which it extends are all cylindrical. Accordingly, Hilgner does not disclose a polygonal-shaped sensor or a polygonal-shaped envelope surface.

New Claim 20 is also allowable over Tow. For example, consistent with the above discussion, inner radial surface 86 of Tow's adapter 70' is cylindrical. Moreover, as illustrated in Fig. 4, Tow's sensor 20 is not polygonal-shaped. Accordingly, Hilgner does not disclose a polygonal-shaped sensor or a polygonal-shaped envelope surface.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 18, 2008

By: Peter T. deVore  
Matthew L. Schneider  
Registration No. 32814

Peter T. deVore  
Registration No. 60361

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620